

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The rejection and objection presented in the Office Action dated April 1, 2009, (hereinafter Office Action) have been considered. Reconsideration of the pending claims and allowance of the application in view of the present response is respectfully requested.

The Office Action includes discrepancies as to the status of Claims 17 and 18. At page two, sentence number three, Claims 1-11 and 14-18 are indicated as being allowed; however, sentence number five indicates that Claim 17 is rejected. It is Applicant's understanding that Claims 17 and 18 (since Claim 18 depends from Claim 17) were intended to be rejected under § 101; therefore, the rejection of Claim 17 is addressed below. If this understanding is incorrect, Applicant requests clarification and an opportunity to respond.

With respect to the § 101 rejection of Claim 17, Claim 17 has been amended to indicate that the claimed method is performed in a terminal thereby tying the method to another statutory category of subject matter. Support for these changes may be found in the original Specification, for example, in Fig. 3 and at paragraph [0023]; therefore, these changes do not introduce new matter. Since the changes are believed to overcome the rejection, Applicant requests that the rejection of Claim 17 (and Claim 18) be withdrawn.

With respect to the objection to the Specification, Applicant respectfully traverses. First, it is noted that the subject matter of a claim need not be described literally in the Specification (*i.e.*, using the same terms or *in haec verba*), and an applicant is not limited to the nomenclature used in the application as filed. MPEP §§ 608.01(o) and 2163.01. Second, paragraph [0020] discloses that computer software (computer executable instructions) may be stored into any memory means, such as the hard disk of a PC or a CD-ROM disc. A hard disk of a PC and a CD-ROM disc clearly constitute computer-readable media. However, in an effort to prevent an interpretation of the claimed media as including non-physical media, paragraph [0020] and Claims 12, 13, and 19 have also been amended. The changes to the claims are consistent with the disclosure of paragraph [0020]; therefore, the changes do not introduce new matter. Since the Specification provides proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter, Applicant accordingly requests that the objection be removed.

In accordance with the above comments and amendments, Applicant submits that each of the claims is in condition for allowance.

Authorization is given to charge Deposit Account No. 50-3581 (IHN.023.US) any necessary fees for this filing. If the Examiner believes it necessary or helpful, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss any issues related to this case.

Respectfully submitted,

HOLLINGSWORTH & FUNK, LLC
8009 34th Avenue South, Suite 125
Minneapolis, MN 55425
952.854.2700

Date: July 1, 2009

By: /Erin M. Nichols/

Erin M. Nichols
Reg. No. 57,125